



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/496,389	02/02/2000	Boris V. Marchegiani	341-001	6138
27776 7590 06/23/2009 WARD & OLIVO SUITE 300 382 SPRINGFIELD AVENUE SUMMIT, NJ 07901				
EXAMINER COLBERT, ELLA				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3696				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/23/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/496,389

Applicant(s)

BORIS MARCHEGANI

Examiner

Ella Colbert

Art Unit

3696

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 April 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4-6, 8-11, 15, 17, 19-22, 24, 26, 28, 38 and 39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 15, 17, 19-22, 24, 26, 28, 38 and 39 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4-6, and 8-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 4-6, 8-11, 15, 17, 19-22, 24, 26, 28, 38, and 39 are pending. Group I, claims 1, 4-6, and 8-11 were elected and claims 15, 17, 19-22, 24, 26, 28, 38, and 39 were withdrawn without traverse in the response to the Election/Restriction and Request for Extension of Time filed 04/08/09.

Group I, claims 1, 4-6, and 8-11 were elected for prosecution on the merits and claims 15, 17, 19-22, 24, 26, 28, 38, and 39 have been withdrawn.

Applicants' election without traverse of claims 1, 4-6, and 8-11 in the response filed 04/08/09 is acknowledged.

Claims 15, 17, 19-22, 24, 26, 28, 38, and 39 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention. There being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in the reply filed on 04/08/09.

Claim Objections

Claims 1 and 11 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 1, the first claim limitation in the body of the claim needs a semicolon after "term".

Claim 11, recites "tender of a multi-variable commodity having at least one term;". This line should recite "tender of a multi-variable commodity having at least one term;".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1 and 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites "tender having an exception request which permits a change to ...; ..., wherein said at least one term of said at least one tender, wherein said ... only if said exception ..., wherein said at least one term ...". It is vague and indefinite what Applicant means by an "exception request" and what the "exception request is for". Is the exception request" for the multi-variable characteristic of the commodity?

The term "permits" is not a positive recitation. A positive recitation is "which can make a change to ...". This claim also recites "requested by said tender recipient only if said exception request (can make a change) permits a change ...". "If" is a conditional statement and nothing else happens in the body of the claim when this condition is not met. It is considered vague and indefinite since there is not any other condition being met.

Applicant(s) are reminded that as a matter of linguistic precision, optional or conditional elements (e.g. "if," "may," etc.) do not narrow the claims because they can always be omitted. See also MPEP §2106 II C: "Language that suggest or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation.

The following examples of language in a claim that may raise a question as to the limiting effect of the language in a claim are: (A) statements of intended use or field of use, (B) "adapted to" or "adapted for" clauses, (C) "wherein" clauses, or (D)

"whereby" clauses. The list of examples is not intended to be exhaustive." MPEP 2106 II C.

Claim 8 recites "receives the stored data, analyzes the stored data, and transmits the information to a further processing device, wherein the information is transmitted in response to the received data". It is vague and indefinite as to what data is received from storage and analyzed, and what information is transmitted in response to the received data. Claims 9 and 10 have a similar problem because it is vague and indefinite as to what information is being received.

Claims 4-6 and 8-10 are also rejected for their dependency from a rejected base claim.

Conclusion

"An essential purpose of patent examination is to fashion claims that are precise, clear, correct, and unambiguous. Only in this way can uncertainties of claim scope be removed ...". *In re Zletz* 13 USPQ2d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

"We are not persuaded by any sound reason why, at any time before the patent is granted, an applicant should have limitations of the specification read into a claim where no express statement of the limitation is included in the claim ... However, this court has consistently taken the tack that claims yet unpatented are to be given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification during the examination of a patent application since the applicant may then amend his claims, the thought being to reduce the possibility that, after the patent is granted, the claims may be interpreted as giving broader coverage than is justified." *In re Prater*, 162 USPQ 541 (CCPA 1969).

USPTO personnel are to give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the supporting disclosure. *In re Morris*, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997).

Limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim should not be read into the claim. *E-Pass Techs., Inc. v. 3Com Corp.*, 343 F.3d 1364, 1369, 67 USPQ2d 1947, 1950 (Fed. Cir. 2003) (claims must be interpreted "in view of the specification" without importing limitations from the specification into the claims unnecessarily). *In re Prater*, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-551 (CCPA 1969). See also *In re Zletz*, 893 F.2d 319, 321-22, 13 USPQ2d 1320, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 1989) ("During patent examination the pending claims must be interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allow.... The reason is simply that during patent prosecution when claims can be amended, ambiguities should be recognized, scope and breadth of language explored, and clarification imposed.... An essential purpose of patent examination is to fashion claims that are precise, clear, correct, and unambiguous. Only

in this way can uncertainties of claim scope be removed, as much as possible, during the administrative process.”).

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ella Colbert whose telephone number is 571-272-6741. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, and Thursday, 5:30AM-3:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dixon Thomas can be reached on 571-272-6803. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ella Colbert/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3696

Application/Control Number: 09/496,389

Page 7

Art Unit: 3696

June 22, 2009